



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

itself involves no peculiar legislative action. Accordingly there seems no compelling reason why the articles should not lie within equity's jurisdiction to reform. See *Cleghorn v. Zumwalt*, 83 Cal. 155. The exercise of a jurisdiction to reform for mistake in any given case would depend, of course, upon the degree to which strangers, who had relied upon the articles as filed, might be prejudiced. Nor would such control of corporate charters by equity be wholly exceptional, for it has long exercised similar supervision in disregarding the corporate fiction when necessary to avoid unconscionable use of the franchise. See *United States v. Milwaukee Refrigerator Transit Co.*, 142 Fed. 247, 254.

**CRIMINAL LAW — DEFENSES — PARTICIPATION TO DETECT CRIME.** — The defendant had received money from X to make an illegal purchase of whisky from Y, and under promise of immunity given by a deputy sheriff, in order to acquire evidence against Y, made the purchase, and delivered the whisky to X. The defendant was then indicted under a statute making it a crime to act as agent of the buyer in an unlawful sale of intoxicating liquor. *Held*, that a conviction is proper. *Brantley v. State*, 65 So. 512 (Miss.).

A detective who coöperates with a criminal for the purpose of getting evidence against him cannot be guilty of an offense for which an *animus furandi* is required. *Price v. People*, 109 Ill. 100. See *Commonwealth v. Hollister*, 157 Pa. 13, 27 Atl. 386. Even where this element is not essential, although *mens rea* is clear from the detective's intentional participation in the criminal act, he will be protected. See *Carroll v. Commonwealth*, 84 Pa. St. 107; *Wright v. State*, 7 Tex. Cr. App. 574. This immunity has been carried to the dangerous extent of protecting the detective where, had he not been acting in that capacity, he would have been independently guilty of the offense he was endeavoring to detect. *Regina v. Bannen*, 2 Moody C. C. 309; *State v. Torphy*, 78 Mo. App. 206. But see *Dever v. State*, 37 Tex. Cr. App. 396, 30 S. W. 1071. The principal case is clearly right in not extending the immunity to the commission of a crime quite distinct from that committed by the criminal. The proper test, however, would seem to be not whether the crime committed was a separate offense, but rather, whether the detective's crime be one for which he could be held independently, though the criminal had never gone forward and completed the offense. Any other principle would give immunity to the commission of murder as a means of detecting a murderer.

**EASEMENTS — NATURE AND CLASSES OF EASEMENTS — RIGHT TO AN UNOBSTRUCTED VIEW OF THE PREMISES FROM THE HIGHWAY.** — A.'s building projected into the highway eighteen inches beyond B.'s, so that a portion of the side wall was exposed to view from the street. A. was in the habit of using this wall for advertising purposes. B. set up signboards at right angles to the front of his building, extending from a point about eight inches from the ground upward for twenty-two feet, at about nine inches from the side wall of A.'s building, entirely obscuring the view of the wall from the street. In a suit by B. for damages from A.'s pasting bills over these boards, A. counterclaims, asking an injunction to restrain B. from obstructing the view of his wall. *Held*, that the injunction will be granted. *Cobb v. Saxby*, [1914] 3 K. B. 822.

For a discussion of the question whether this case necessitates a recognition of a "right of publicity," see NOTES, p. 499.

**EVIDENCE — DOCUMENTS — AUTHENTICATION OF LETTERS NOT IN SENDER'S HANDWRITING.** — In an action on an account, the plaintiff offered in evidence letters alleged to have been sent by the defendant, an illiterate. The plaintiff could not authenticate the letters by direct proof, but showed that they related to the account, and were consistent with facts as otherwise proved. Some of the letters purported to contain checks, and corresponding checks were pro-